

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO
09/965,851	10/01/2001	Yoshiaki Kinoshita	Q66200	4036
75	590 08/28/2006		EXAM	INER
SUGHRUE, MION, ZINN, MACPEAK & SEAS, PLLC		BRINICH, STEPHEN M		
2100 Pennsylvania Avenue, N.W. Washington, DC 20037-3202		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
			2625	

DATE MAILED: 08/28/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

U.S. Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS

P.O. Box 1450

Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450

09 915 851 APPLICATION NO.1

APPLICATION NO./ FILING DATE CONTROL NO.

FIRST NAMED INVENTOR I
PATENT IN REEXAMINATION

ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.

EXAMINER

ART UNIT

PAPER

20060818

DATE MAILED:

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Commissioner for Patents

	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
Advisory Action	09/965,851	KINOSHITA, YOSHIAKI	
Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Stephen M. Brinich	2625	
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ars on the cover sheet with the d	orrespondence add	ress
THE REPLY FILED 11 August 2006 FAILS TO PLACE THIS A	PPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR	ALLOWANCE.	
 The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or or this application, applicant must timely file one of the follow places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a Not a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliant time periods: The period for reply expiresmonths from the mailing the period for reply expiresmonths from the period for reply expires	wing replies: (1) an amendment, aff stice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in o ce with 37 CFR 1.114. The reply mu g date of the final rejection.	idavit, or other evider compliance with 37 C ust be filed within one	nce, which FR 41.31; or (3) of the following
b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection. Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).			
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of ex under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b) NOTICE OF APPEAL	tension and the corresponding amount shortened statutory period for reply origing than three months after the mailing da).	of the fee. The approprinally set in the final Offite of the final rejection, of	iate extension fee ce action; or (2) as even if timely filed,
 The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in comp filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any exte a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed AMENDMENTS 	nsion thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to	avoid dismissal of th	ns of the date of e appeal. Since
 The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, (a) They raise new issues that would require further co (b) They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below 	nsideration and/or search (see NO	TE below);	
(c) They are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or			
(d) They present additional claims without canceling a NOTE:			
 4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.1 5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s) 	:	•	,
6. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be all non-allowable claim(s).	•	•	J
7. For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) how the new or amended claims would be rejected is protected. The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows: Claim(s) allowed:		ll be entered and an ϵ	explanation of
Claim(s) objected to: <u>2-4,9 and 10</u> . Claim(s) rejected: <u>1 and 5-8</u> . Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:			

	(-,			
FIDAMIT	OP OT	HED E	VIDENCE	

3. The affidavit or other evidence	filed after a final action, but before or on the date of filing a Notice of Appeal will not be entered
	ovide a showing of good and sufficient reasons why the affidavit or other evidence is necessary and
was not earlier presented. See	e 37 CFR 1.116(e).

- 9. The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing a Notice of Appeal, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to overcome all rejections under appeal and/or appellant fails to provide a showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 41.33(d)(1).
- 10. The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation of the status of the claims after entry is below or attached.

REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER

- 11. The request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: See Attachment.
- 12. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s). (PTO/SB/08 or PTO-1449) Paper No(s).

3.	П	Other:	

PTOL-303 (Rev. 7-05)

Art Unit: 2625

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Arguments

1. Applicant's arguments filed 8/11/06 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Applicant argues (8/11/06 Remarks: page 2, line 18 - page 3, line 8) that Applicant's previous argument (2/10/06 Remarks: page 7, lines 2-4) "...if there is no existence of a particular condition, the process will proceed forward in the same manner as if there was no detecting section output, which is consistent with the first mode" is relevant only to the previously outstanding rejection under 35 USC §112, and not to the outstanding rejection under 35 USC §102.

However, this argument was offered in order to assert that the claim language lends itself to a clear and consistent interpretation. Such an interpretation would be relevant both to the issue of claim clarity under 35 USC §112 and to the question of the claim's relationship to the Prior Art under 35 USC §102.

Applicant argues (8/11/06 Remarks: page 3, lines 9-19) that Sievert is not readable upon the claimed invention, because neither of the two modes of Sievert that Examiner read upon the two claimed modes meets the recited element of being independent of the existence of a detection section.

However, as noted in the outstanding Final Rejection, one of the two modes of Sievert (starting with element 320 of Figure 4B) is selected when both elements of the detection section (elements 302 and 304 of Figure 4B) fail to indicate that a threshold has been exceeded. In the absence of such comparisons, this would inherently always be the case (i.e. a threshold would never be indicated as having been exceeded in the absence of a threshold detector). Thus, the operation of the mode that is selected in this case is independent of the existence of a detection section.

Conclusion

2. Any inquiry concerning the contents of this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Stephen M. Brinich at 571-272-7430.

Any inquiry relating to the status of this application or proceeding or any inquiry of a general nature concerning application processing should be directed to the Tech Center 2600 Customer Service center at 571-272-2600 or to the USPTO Contact Center at 800-786-9199 or 571-272-1000.

The examiner can normally be reached on weekdays 8:00-5:30, alternate Fridays off.

The examiner's unit designation has been changed from "Art Unit 2624" to "Technology Division 2625" (as of March 20, 2006).

Application/Control Number: 09/965,851 Page 4

Art Unit: 2625

If attempts to contact the examiner and the Customer Service Center are unsuccessful, supervisor David Moore can be contacted at 571-272-7437.

Faxes pertaining to this application should be directed to the Tech Center 2600 official fax number, which is 571-273-8300 (as of July 15, 2005).

Hand-carried correspondence may be delivered to the Customer Service Window, located at the Randolph Building, 401 Dulany Street, Alexandria, VA 22314.

Stephen M Brinich Examiner Technology Division 2625

smb **Smy** August 18, 2006

THOMAS D.
THE LEE
PRIMARY EXAMINER